



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,660	10/29/2001	Philip C. Hanses	014208.1430 (50-01-004)	6955

7590 12/01/2004

Charles S. Fish, Esq.  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
----------

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/032,660

Applicant(s)

HANSES ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/18/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 40 are pending for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. Claims 13 – 24, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed to non-statutory subject matter.
3. Claims 13 – 24, and 40 are directed to method steps which can be practiced mentally in conjunction with pen and paper, therefore they are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, as claimed, it is uncertain what performs each of the claimed method steps. Moreover, each of the claimed steps, inter alia, receiving, integrating, and processing can be practiced mentally in conjunctions with pen and paper. The claimed steps do not define a machine or computer implemented process [see MPEP 2106]. Therefore, the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. (The examiner suggests applicant to change “method” to “computer implemented method” in the preamble to overcome the outstanding 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1 – 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms are not clearly understood:

i. As to claim 1, lines 2 - 3, it is not clearly understood what “a request that is communicated by a source” means, and it is conflicted with the term “the request is returned to the source, at lines 10 – 11, (i.e., is it means a request that is transmitted from a user or client). “communicated by” should be followed by a mean. “source” should be referred to data source, not a place or person. Examiner suggests that applicant should change, all claims that refer “source”, to be another terminology that is clearly understood.

ii. As to claim 2, lines 2 – 8, it is not clearly understood what “business logic process” means. The term is indefinite. It is not clearly defined in the specification. For examination purpose, examiner will press “business

logic process” to mean “logic process after the request received by the servlet”.

iii. As to claims 3 and 4, lines 1 – 2, it is not clearly understood what “business logic process” means. The term is indefinite. It is not clearly defined in the specification. For examination purpose, examiner will press “business logic process” to mean “logic process after the request received by the servlet”.

iv. As to claims 13 – 16, see rejection for claims 1 – 4 above.

v. As to claims 25 – 28, see rejection for claims 1 – 4 above.

vi. As to claims 37 - 38, see rejection for claims 1 - 2 above.

vii. As to claims 39 and 40, see rejection for claim 1 above

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2126

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**7. Claims 1 – 5, 7, 10 – 12, 13 – 17, 19, 22 – 29, 31, and 34 - 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham, US publication no. 2002/0046240.**

**8. As to claim 1,** Graham teaches the steps of  
framework (framework, col. 1 section [0005] and [0012] and col. 2 section [0021] and [0022] operable to process a request (request) that is communicated by source (user's browser) and that includes an associated functionality, wherein framework includes an abstraction layer (application controller) operable to integrate java object into the request such that a generic term (Java bean) associated with the request generated that is insulated from the functionality of the request, and wherein the generic term processed within the framework such that a response (response to be output to the browser) associated with the request is returned to the source.

Graham does not explicitly teach the request includes an associated functionality.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that in the object-oriented program, each call is associated with a method that includes functionality to execute the method.

**9. As to claim 2,** Graham teaches the step of wherein the framework includes business logic process (logic process of the application, col. 2 section [0021], [0022],

Art Unit: 2126

[0024] and col. 4 section [0044]) operable to translate (convert or translate) a portion of the generic term into one or more business objects (business objects representing java beans) associated with an action to be executed within the framework and to facilitate processing of the generic term and wherein the business logic process further operable link (link before communicating) one more the business objects before communicating the business objects.

10. **As to claim 3**, Graham teaches the step of wherein the business logic process is operable direct navigation of the linked business objects to a step of a task (compiling task) to be completed in the framework.

11. **As to claim 4**, Graham teaches the step of wherein the business logic process may be modified response to variation in one or more parameters associated with the request (pass appropriate parameters, col. 3 section [0038] and col. 4 section [0049]).

12. **As to claim 5**, Graham teaches the steps of wherein the framework includes process runner, the process runner comprising servlet (Java servlet, col. 2 section [0022] operable to identify the java object (java bean) and to invoke navigation component (component that enable user to navigate, col. 4 section [0048]) operable direct the request.

Art Unit: 2126

13. **As to claim 7**, Graham teaches the step comprising of a database (application server database, col. 2 section [0022] and [0025]) operable to store data associated with the request, the data being used generate the response.

14. **As to claim 10**, Graham teaches the step of wherein the source is a program (client's application, col. 1 section [0005] and [0012] and col. 2 section [0021]) that accesses framework via a wireless program device (Internet access).

15. **As to claim 11**, see rejection for claim 4 above.

16. **As to claim 12**, Graham teaches the step of wherein the framework includes a presentation element operable to receive data associated with the request and formulate the response to be communicated to the source in a format native to the source (CORBA-based messaging service, col. 2 section [0022]).

17. **As to claim 13**, this is the method claim of claim 1. See rejection for claim 1 above.

18. **As to claims 14 – 17**, see rejection for claims 2 – 5 above.

19. **As to claim 19**, see rejection for claim 7 above.



20. **As to claims 22 – 24**, see rejection for claims 10 – 12 above.
21. **As to claim 25**, this is the software claim of claim 1. See rejection for claim 1 above.
22. **As to claims 26 – 29**, see rejection for claims 2 – 5 above.
23. **As to claim 31**, see rejection for claim 7 above.
24. **As to claims 34 - 36**, see rejection for claims 10 – 12 above.
25. **As to claim 37**, this is the system claim of claim 1. See rejection for claim 1 above.
26. **As to claim 38**, see rejection for claim 2 above.
27. **Claims 6, 18, 30, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham, US publication no. 2002/0046240 in view of Chan, US patent no. 6,769,123.**

Art Unit: 2126

28. **As to claim 6**, Graham does not teach the step of wherein the navigation component is operable to monitor the request and store history associated with one or more actions associated with the request, history being used further direct the request.

Chan teaches the step of wherein the navigation component is operable to monitor (navigation component monitors the dialog tree performed on request by the GUI en

gine, col. 9 lines 15 – 27) the request and store history associated with one or more actions associated with the request, history being used further direct the request (a containment tree are used by GUI .... is created and store to represent the device, col. 9 lines 29 – 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Graham and Chan's system because Chan's navigation component would provide a history of actions to keep track of requests to enable user to navigate the desired web page while the user moves back and forth on different pages.

29. **As to claims 18 and 30**, see rejection for claim 6 above.

30. **As to claim 39**, Graham teaches the steps of

framework (framework, col. 1 section [0005] and [0012] and col. 2 section [0021] and [0022] operable to process a request (request) that is communicated by source (user's browser) and that includes an associated functionality (each call is associated

Art Unit: 2126

with a method that includes functionality to execute the method), wherein framework includes an abstraction layer (application controller) operable to integrate java object into the request such that a generic term (Java bean) associated with the request generated that is insulated from the functionality of the request, and wherein the generic term processed within the framework such that a response (response to be output to the browser) associated with the request is returned to the source, wherein the framework includes business logic process (logic process of the application, col. 2 section [0021], [0022], [0024] and col. 4 section [0044]) operable to translate (convert or translate) a portion of the generic term into one or more business objects (business objects representing java beans) associated with an action to be executed within the framework and to facilitate processing of the generic term and wherein the business logic process further operable link (link before communicating) one more the business objects before communicating the business objects and to direct navigation of the linked business objects to a step of a task (compiling task) to be completed in the framework, and wherein the framework includes process runner, the process runner comprising servlet (Java servlet, col. 2 section [0022] operable to identify the java object (java bean) and to invoke navigation component (component that enable user to navigate, col. 4 section [0048]) operable direct the request.

Graham does not explicitly teach the step of wherein the navigation component is operable to monitor the request and store history associated with one or more actions associated with the request, history being used further direct the request.

Chan teaches the step of wherein the navigation component is operable to monitor (navigation component monitors the dialog tree performed on request by the GUI engine, col. 9 lines 15 – 27) the request and store history associated with one or more actions associated with the request, history being used further direct the request (a containment tree are used by GUI .... is created and store to represent the device, col. 9 lines 29 – 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Graham and Chan's system because Chan's navigation component would provide a history of actions to keep track of requests to enable user to navigate the desired web page while the user moves back and forth on different pages.

**31. Claims 8 – 9, 20 – 21, 32 – 33, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham, US publication no. 2002/0046240 in view of Monday, US patent no. US patent no. 6,480,860.**

**32. As to claim 8,** Graham does not explicitly teach the step of wherein the framework includes an additional abstraction layer operable insulate the generic term from a protocol associated with the database.

Monday teaches the step of wherein insulating the generic term from a protocol associated with the database (Javabean is a particular type of software component ..... allows the software component to access data within the database 128, col. 5 lines 45 – 58 and col. 7 lines 5 - 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Graham and Monday's system because Monday's insulating Javabeans from a protocol would provide a flexibility access to a database without a protocol, and so minimizing coding and tool for the system.

33. **As to claim 9**, Monday teaches the step comprising a data maps element (col. 4 lines 55 – 67) operable to provide an interface between the database and the generic term.

34. **As to claims 20 and 21**, see rejection for claims 8 and 9 above respectively.

35. **As to claims 32 and 33**, see rejection for claims 8 and 9 above respectively.

36. **As to claim 40**, Graham teaches the steps of framework (framework, col. 1 section [0005] and [0012] and col. 2 section [0021] and [0022] operable to process a request (request) that is communicated by source (user's browser) and that includes an associated functionality (each call is associated with a method that includes functionality to execute the method), wherein framework includes

Art Unit: 2126

an abstraction layer (application controller) operable to integrate java object into the request such that a generic term (Java bean) associated with the request generated that is insulated from the functionality of the request, and wherein the generic term processed within the framework such that a response (response to be output to the browser) associated with the request is returned to the source, wherein the framework includes business logic process (logic process of the application, col. 2 section [0021], [0022], [0024] and col. 4 section [0044]) operable to translate (convert or translate) a portion of the generic term into one or more business objects (business objects representing java beans) associated with an action to be executed within the framework and to facilitate processing of the generic term and wherein the business logic process further operable link (link before communicating) one more the business objects before communicating the business objects and to direct navigation of the linked business objects to a step of a task (compiling task) to be completed in the framework; a database (application server database, col. 2 section [0022] and [0025]) operable to store data associated with the request, the data being used generate the response.

Graham does not explicitly teach the step of a data maps element operable to provide an interface between the database and the generic term.

Monday teaches the step of a data maps element (col. 4 lines 55 – 67) operable to provide an interface (XML interface) between the database and the generic term.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Graham and Monday's system because

Art Unit: 2126

Monday's data maps element would provide a user-friendly interface for user to access information via the internet.

### ***Conclusion***

37. The prior art made of record and not relied upon request is considered to be pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Desrochers, US patent no. 6,553,405, demonstrating web server application.

Shapiro et al., US publication no. 2002/0120787, demonstrating a method for accessing to backend system.


38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (571)272-3763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2126

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ph  
November 28, 2004

  
MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100